Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Initially, it is noted that claim 21 has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-21, 23-25 and 27-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-21, 23, 24 and 26-31 have been amended so as to address this rejection. In light of the amendments to claims 1 and 26, claims 22 and 25, respectively, have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein as being redundant thereto.

Claims 1-20 and 22-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bates (US 6,049,667).

The above rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over Bates, since claim 1 recites a computer-readable storage medium storing a compiler program for converting a source program into an object program, the compiler program causing a computer to function, in part, as: an address saving program generating means for generating an address saving program for saving in a memory a data memory area address used by a calling program module included in the source program; and an address resetting program generating means for generating an address resetting program for reading and resetting the data memory area address saved in the memory for the calling program module after the return from a second subprogram as a transfer end to a first subprogram. Bates fails to disclose or suggest these features of claim 1.

In the rejection, it is indicated that the block 106 in Figure 3 of Bates corresponds to the claimed address saving program generating means. The description of the block 106 states that if an access to an address space is found, control passes to the block 106 to generate retrieval code for retrieving a 16-byte representation of a pointer from a 32-bit representation thereof. Thus, the block 106 operates to change a 32-bit representation into a 16-byte representation at the time of compiling. The block 106 achieves this by dividing the 32-bit pointer into an index value and an offset value, converting the index value into a 16-byte base address with the use of

a segment table, and combining the converted base address with the offset value to create the 16-byte pointer. (See Figure 2). Thus, from this description, the block 106 of Bates in no way discloses or suggests that a data memory area address for used by a calling program module included in a source program is saved in a memory.

Further, the rejection indicates that the block 114 in Figure 3 of Bates corresponds to the claimed address resetting program generating means. The block 114 is disclosed as replacing the call to the memory allocation function with alternate memory allocation program code. In other words, with the block 114, the call to the memory allocation function is replaced with alternate memory allocation program code which is used when creating intermediate code. However, the process in the block 114 merely creates program code. Therefore, the block 114 of Bates does not disclose or suggest that the data memory address area saved in the memory for the calling program module is read and reset after the return from the second subprogram as a transfer end to the first subprogram.

As described above, according to claim 1, the data memory area address for the calling program module is saved in the memory, and the data memory area address saved in the memory for the calling program module is reset after the return from the second subprogram as a transfer end to the first subprogram. Accordingly, even if the calling program module reenters the other program module, the data memory area address for the calling program module can be retracted. Thus, the reentrant object program can be generated to realize dynamic links between the modules. It is apparent that Bates fails to disclose or suggest the address saving program generating means and the address resetting program generating means as recited in claim 1.

Further, independent claims 23, 24, 26-28 are patentable over Bates for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1-21, 23, 24 and 26-31 are allowable over Bates. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated or to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1-21, 23, 24 and 26-31. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-21, 23, 24 and 26-31 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Masaki KAWAI et al.

By: /David M. Ovedovitz/
2009.03.04 16:21:22 -05'00'

David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicants

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 4, 2009